



94  
B) IFW

## PATENT APPLICATION

### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q64476

Hiroshi TANAKA, et al.

Allowed: November 14, 2005

Appln. No.: 09/854,935

Group Art Unit: 2661

Confirmation No.: 7946

Examiner: Michael A. DELGADO

Filed: May 15, 2001

For: INFORMATION INTERMEDIARY APPARATUS, INFORMATION MANAGEMENT APPARATUS, AND INFORMATION COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

### COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

#### MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant makes the following comments on the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The Examiner relies on features from an exemplary embodiment of the present invention in an attempt to define the claims. The Examiner's description of the claimed features is inaccurate as it fails to recite or even carefully paraphrase the language of the claims. It is respectfully noted that the exemplary embodiment of the present invention does not limit the claims. The Examiner's statement should not be interpreted as identifying patentable features in any of the claims.

The claims are carefully written to precisely define the bounds of the invention, and people reading these remarks hereafter should note that any difference between the Examiner's

Comments on Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance

U.S. Appln. No. 09/854,935

Attorney Docket No.: Q64476

language and the language of the claims should be resolved by recourse to only the express language of the claims.

Patent Office personnel are requested to note that the present submission **does not adversely affect the patent term adjustment** accrued by Applicant to date. As emphasized in the "Clarification of 37 C.F.R. §1.704(c)(10) – Reduction of Patent Term Adjustment for Certain Types of Papers Filed After a Notice of Allowance Has Been Mailed," 1247OG111 (6/26/01), "a response to the examiner's reasons for allowance" is an example of a paper that does "not cause substantial interference and delay in the patent issue process" and is "not considered a 'failure to engage in reasonable efforts' to conclude processing or examination of the application." Therefore, the Applicant remains entitled to the full patent term adjustment set forth on page 3 of the Notice of Allowance dated November 14, 2005.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 10, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Nataliya Dyerson  
Registration No. 56,616

Attorney Docket No.: Q64476